

To: Skubinna, Paul[PSkubinna@mt.gov]
Cc: Kusnierz, Lisa[kusnierz.lisa@epa.gov]
From: Laidlaw, Tina
Sent: Wed 3/25/2015 11:15:23 PM
Subject: RE: Nutrient Optimization language
Final Optimization Study Boilerplate Tina edits.docx

....
>>>

Hey Paul,

Thanks for the opportunity to review this information. Attached are my comments. I realize that you were trying to distinguish between the requirements versus what DEQ is encouraging facilities to do. However, since they both relate to how a facility should approach an optimization study, and what should be considered, I thought it made sense to keep them connected. And, the alternatives analysis component is really important, even if it's not a requirement. Also, as currently written, the focus seems to be on trading which is only one of the things that should be considered.

Hope these comments help. We can discuss them tomorrow if you have any questions.

Tina

From: Skubinna, Paul [mailto:PSkubinna@mt.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2015 2:36 PM
To: Laidlaw, Tina; Kusnierz, Lisa
Subject: FW: Nutrient Optimization language

FYI – let me know if you have major concerns.

Paul Skubinna

Water Protection Bureau

MT Dept of Environmental Quality

406.444.3639

From: Skubinna, Paul
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2015 2:38 PM
To: LaVigne, Paul; Suplee, Mike; McDunn, John; Romankiewicz, Christopher; Boettcher, Peter
Cc: Griffeth, Thomas; Kenning, Jon; Moser, Kurt
Subject: Nutrient Optimization language

Howdy All, thanks for the input on developing nutrient optimization study language. Attached is what we came up with as our final version to go in the fact sheet and permit. Know that we considered everyone's comments and input closely, but there, at times, only subtle differences

between an enforceable permit condition and a useful and informative well writer document.
Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks again for the input and participation.

--PS

Paul Skubinna

Water Protection Bureau

MT Dept of Environmental Quality

406.444.3639